

Thus have you heard in these two letters, the judgements of those excellent Churches of the French and Scottish, touching the things in controversie. Now if to these I should adde all other which are of the same judgement and of their opinion: the number of Churches would be so many, that the adversaries should evidently see and perceive what small cause they have to charge us thus with singularity, as though we were post alone, and none to be of our opinion. And it may here also be noted, that the most ancientest fathers of this our owne country, as Master Cogges, Master Docter Turner, Master Whitehead, and many other^{le} that dead, some yet living, from whose mouthes and pens, the^a that of these received, first the light of the Gospell could never^{subt} brought to yeeld or consent unto such things as are now forced with so great extremitie.

FINIS.

Thus have you heard in these two letters, the judgements of those excellent Churches of the French and Scottish, touching the things in controversie. Now if to these I should adde all other which are of the same judgement and of their opinion: the number of Churches would be so many, that the adversaries should evidently see and perceive what small cause they have to charge us thus with singularity, as though we were post alone, and none to be of our opinion. And it may here also be noted, that the most ancientest fathers of this our owne country, as Master Cogges, Master Docter Turner, Master Whitehead, and many other dead, some yet living, from whose mouthes and pens, the light of these received, first the light of the Gospell could never brought to yeeld or consent unto such things as are now forced with so great extremitie.

FINIS.

2

A
LEARNED TREATISE
OF THE
SABBATH,

WRITTEN

By M^r EDWARD BRERWOOD
Professor in Gresham Colledge,
LONDON.

TO M^r NICHOLAS BYFIELD
Preacher in Chester.

With M^r BYFIELD'S answer and
M^r BRERWOOD'S Reply.

The second Edition diligently corrected.



AT OXFORD,

Printed by John Lichfield Printer to the Famous
Vniversity, for Thomas Huggins.
Anno Dom. 1631.

LEARNED TREATISE
ON THE
SABBATH.

W. L. G. WOOD

Author of "The Sabbath School"

and "The Sabbath School"

NEW YORK: Published by
J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO.,

101 N. 3rd St., Philadelphia.

1858.



10: 8561

AT OXFORD,

Printed by John Baskin, Printer to the University.

Vol. 1, No. 1, for Thomas H. Baskin.

1858.



*Proue all things, hold fast that which is good:
1 Thes. 5:21.*

*For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodnesse, and
righteousnesse, and truth, proving what is accepta-
ble to the Lord; Ephes. 5.9.10.*

*Holy Father, Sanctify them through thy truth:
Thy word is truth. Ioh. 17.17.*





Printed at the University of Cambridge
by J. Sturges, Printer to the University
In the Strand, near St. Dunstons Church
1784

Holy Father, Sanctify them
The word is true





A
TREATISE OF
THE SABBATH WRIT-
TEN BY M^r EDWARD

BREREWOOD of Lon-
don, to M^r NICOLAS
BYFIELD Preacher
in Chester.

SIR I am but a stranger vnto
you, yet I am bold to trouble
you, because you haue troubled
me, with as strange an occasion:
There is a young man (one
John Brerewood , dwelling in
this Citty, but borne in that)
whom his Father & Grandfather, when they left this
World, left very young: And left he was especial-
ly to my care, who am his Vnckle. That youth I plac-
ed

ced here in *London*, to serue in condition of an apprentice: and placed he is with a man of so good religion, report, & trade, that if I might haue picked him a master in the whole Citty, I thinke I should haue chosen none before him. In this mans service hee hath spent two yeares and more, and (God shewing him, and in his behalfe me also more mercy then either of vs deserved,) I began to receiue comfort of him after some sorrow, that his former vntowardnes had caused, and to recover good hope, after my former doubt and feare; but yet for all this, Gods good pleasure it was to abate this contentment of mine, and by the youths new follies, to bring me into new perplexities: for being not long since sent to *Chester* about his masters businesse, hee returned againe so strangely altered, that I haue seldome seene in so short a time so great a change. For so dejected he was in his countenance, so dull and wrehlesse about his businesse, so alienated quite from his master, and so obstinately resolu'd (whether by faire meanes or by towle) to forsake his service, that I was not fuller of sorrow to see him so changed, then of wonder to imagine how he became so. And yet the care and paines I tooke by the endeavour of my selfe and of my friends to recover and to resettlement him, was equall to both; and so much more they were, because I laboured to cure a disease, whereof I could not perceive the cause. For the pretences which at first hee made of the vnablenesse of his body and toilesomenesse of his service, I knowe were but faigned excuses,
or

or else complaints of lazinesse; as being assured that there are 20000 in this City of lesse bones, that make no bones of greater labour. But the true cause of all this distemper, fell out to be at last a case of conscience (& full glad I was that the case proved no worse) then that he had such feeling of conscience, (for I had imagined sundry others) although it grieved me not a little, to see his conscience so seduced; And the point that pricked him was this: his Master on the Lords day, sent him forth sometimes on errands, as to bid guests, or fetch wine, or giue his horse provender (which last his Master remembreth not that ever hee bad him past once) or about some other light businesse: and he was instructed (he said) that to doe these things or any other worke on the *Sabbath* day, although it were such work as might lawfully be done on another day, and although he did it not of his own disposition, but onely in obedience to his Masters command, yet was a sinne and transgression of Gods commandement touching the *Sabbath*; and that hee was not bound to yeeld, nay that hee sinned against God in yeelding obedience to every such commandement of his Masters that day, which by the precept of Almighty God was wholly & precisely consecrated to rest and the service of God. To this effect (hee told me) he was instructed when he was in *Chester*; & that you Sir were his chiefe instructor; out of which doctrine he deduced (as naturall reason rightly taught him to doe) that he ought in such cases to reiect the command of his Master, and in no sort to performe

it; which because he could not doe without his Masters great offence, and his owne affliction, hee saw no other course to be taken but to forsake his masters service; that so becoming his owne Master, hee might not be commanded to sinne against God; Which resolution of the young mans being so peremptory, and obstinate, as for a time I found it to be, if it moved me both to melancholy and anger who can iustly blame me? For I saw not only a poore youth (my neere kinsman) entangled with the conscience of another mans sinne (if it be sinne) but withal his vtter ruine for his condition in this world hardly ventured, his Master wronged, his friends grieved, and my selfe especially indammaged, that am in bond deeply engaged for him: and yet this was not all that inwardly afflicted mee; but something there was beside that might well stirre as patient an heart as mine to indignation; namely because I perceaued this doctrine of yours, (whereof this resolution of his proceeded, and his ruine was likely to follow) neither to haue good beginning, nor likely to haue good ending; but to beginne in ignorance, and to end in sinne; to beginne in mistaking the Law of God, & to end in the wicked disobedience of servants to their masters, & in the rebellious contempt of the lawes of men. But for the transgression of mens lawes by this doctrine, or the mischiefes that may ensue of it, in the commowealth, I will not meddle: I will not censure the one, nor diuine of the other; you are a teacher of Gods Word, within the compas of that word I will stay with you; and

and by it, examine with your patience, whether this frame of your doctrine be grounded on the rocke or on the sand, on the firme rock of Gods law, or on the fickle sand of your owne fantasie mis-vnderstanding the law; and so whether it tend to the edification or ruine of the Church; for touching the commandement of the *Sabbath*, (vpon which I avert this doctrine of yours cannot be grounded) lay it before you and consider it well; And tell mee to whom is the charge of servants ceasing from worke on the *Sabbath* day giuen? Is it to the servants themselves or to their Masters? It is giuen of servants I confesse; their worke is the matter of the commandement: But I demand whether it be giuen and imposed to the servants themselves; or to the Masters whose servants they are? For if the commandement bee not giuen to them, then doe not they transgresse the commandement, if by their masters they bee set to worke; but the masters to whom the law was giuen, that the servant should not worke; & consequently the sinne is their masters and not theirs: so if the law bee not imposed to them, then it requireth no obedience of them, it obligeth them not; therefore is neither the transgression of it any sinne to them, but only to those to whom it was giuen as a law. For the better clearing of which point let me aske you a questiō or two of other commandements, that for their forme are paralell to this, and whereof you haue no prejudice. God commanded the *Israelites* that no stranger should eate of the paschall Lambe; againe that no

Ammonite nor *Moabite* should enter into the congregation of the Lord, to the tenth generation. Good Sir tell me, did the stranger sinne if hee eat of the Pascheouer being supposed invited? Or did the *Ammonites* or *Moabites* sin if they came into the congregation being admitted? Did the stranger (I say) and the *Ammonites* and the *Moabites*, in these cases sin, of whom the Commandements were giuen? Or the *Israelites* to whom the Commandements were giuen touching them? No but it is clearely the Lords meaning that the *Israelites* should not admit of any Gentile to the participation of the Pascheouer, nor receiue the *Ammonites* and *Moabites* into the congregation of the Lord: Let me aske you one question more, of a case that hath fallen in my remembrance: A precept comes out from the Prince, that every Cittizen in London shall on such a day keepe his seruants within doores and not suffer them to goe abroad. If notwithstanding that precept, some Master sends forth his servant about his businesse, doth the servant transgresse the Princes commandement by obeying his masters? Or ought he by pretence of that precept to disobey his Master and neglect his charge? It is plaine he doth not the former, and therefore hee ought not to doe the latter. For the commandement was giuen to his master not to him; and the purpose of it was to restraine his master from commanding such service, and not to restraine the servant from obeying his Master if it were commanded: therefore it is apparent that the obligation of commandements,

ments pertaineth to them *to whom* they are prescribed as rules, and not to them *of whom* onely (as being the matter of the precept) they are prescribed.

Now that that clause of the Commandement touching servants was not giuen to the servants themselves, but to their masters, in whose power and disposition they are, the text and tenour of the commandement doth clearely import; for marke it well and answer me; to whom is this speech directed? *Neither thy sonne nor thy daughter*, shall doe any worke on the *Sabbath* day: is it not to the Parents? For can this manner of speech (*thy sonne thy daughter*) be rightly directed to any other then the parent? and is not by the same reason the clause that next followeth, (*neither shall thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant* doe any worke on the *Sabbath* day) directed to the Masters of such servants? Seeing that phrase of speech (*thy man-servant thy maid-servant*) cannot rightly be vsed to any other? It is therefore as cleare as the Sunne, euen to meane vnderstandings, (if they will giue but meane attendance, to the tenour of Gods Commandements, rather then the fond interpretations and depravations of men) that that clause of the commandement touching servants cessation from working on the *Sabbath*, is not giuen to servants themselves, but to their Masters concerning them. Or if to any darke vnderstanding, which some grosse cloud may ouershadow, this seeme not cleere enough, the declaration yet of *Moses* himselfe touching the commandement, will make it so: of *Moses*

Exod. 24. v. 18
Exod. 33. v. 11.

I say, who can neither be suspected of ignorance, as hauing beene with the Lord 40 daies together in the Mountaine when he receaued the tables of the Commandements: & with whō the Lord talked familiarly as a man doth with his friend: nor yet of corruption as being by the Lords mouth pronounced faithfull in all his house: he therefore in the 5th of Deuter. 14. (which is the onely place of Scripture, besides the 10. of *Exodus*, where all the branches of that Commandement are repeated) after the severall prohibitions touching the workes of so. mes, servants, cattell, &c. addeth this Epiphonema: *That thy man servant and thy maid servant may rest as well as thou*: It is to this (*Thou*) therefore to whom this charge is directed that the servants should rest vpon the *Sabbath*; who can be conceiued to be no other then the master of those servants; which yet moreouer the reason of that commandement (touching seruants rest immediately added) will better cleere from all exception; for *Remember* (saith *Moses*) *that thy selfe wast a servant in the land of Agypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out thence with a mighty hand, and an out-stretched arme: Therefore the Lord thy God hath commanded thee to make a day of rest*: for to whom was that spoken, *Remember that thy selfe wast a servant in the land of Agypt*, but to them that had beene servants, and now were not servants? Or to what intent and purpose is that (*Remember*) brought in? *Remember that thy selfe wast a servant*, but to moue compassion in them towards their owne servants, and allow them

a time of rest, hauing themselves felt the burthen and affliction of servants in *Ægypt*, and remembring how glad they would haue beene of some remission? But if the commandement of rest had beene directly and immediatly giuen to servants themselves, what needed any perswasion to that effect? Would not servants, over set and wearied with six daies toile, be of themselves glad to rest on the seaventh? Or would they be so hot set on worke, whereby yet they gained nothing, but their labour for their paines, (the profit being another mans,) that the commandement of God could not restraine them, but they needed also to be perswaded? Or if perswasion had beene needfull, were this a convenient perswasion to vse to servants? *Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Ægypt*: which euen now, when they were out of the land of *Ægypt* were servants? And (to proceede with the text) what other importance hath that other reason, which immediatly followeth? And (*remember that the Lord thy God hath brought thee thence*) out of *Ægypt* with a mighty hand and outstretched arme. Therefore the Lord thy God hath commanded thee to make a day of rest. Hath it any other, but to declare that the Lord who had redeemed them from their continuall flaueries, hath iust title & right to impose on them the commandement of the *Sabbath* for their servants rest? Importing as much, as if he had said, although of thy selfe thou shouldest haue compassion of thy servant and allow him rest, Remembring that thy selfe wast a servant in the land

C

of

of *Aegypt*, yet art thou more effectually obliged to doe it, because the Lord hath commanded thee. (*The Lord*) that brought thee out of thralldome and vncessant labours in *Aegypt*, and therefore hath reason to commaund one daies rest, in a weekes revolution (*Thee*) that by his redeeming hand art set at liberty from that labour and servitude. Where marke againe that the Lord is said to haue commanded them, who a little before were said to be seruants in *Egypt* and by his goodnesse were freed from that flauery; which reason could not be intended or directed to them, which still remained in servitude. It is cleare therefore that all this perswasion of *Moses* for servants resting on the *Sabbath*, was not directed to the servants themselves, who to take their ease on the *Sabbath* needed neither to be commanded nor intreated (licence would serue their turne) but to the Masters whose desire of gaine, by the servants labour might stand betwixt the *Sabbath* and the servants rest: And to make an end with the text, with the last wordes of it: what is it, that the Lord for these reasons commanded? was it barely to keepe & obserue the *Sabbath*, as it is in the vulgar *English*, *Latine* and *Greeke* translations? No they are all short, it is *וַיְצַו יְהוָה אֶת מֹשֶׁה לְעֹשֶׂת הַשַּׁבָּת* that is to make a day of rest. Now to make it to be so, importeth not onely to obserue it himsele, but to cause others also to obserue it, which is evidently the property of Masters and gouernors. Wherefore seeing both the commandement touching servants rest from labour on the *Sabbath* day, and reasons added,
by

by *Moses* to perswade that point, (and draw their mindes to obsequiousnesse) are evidently directed to the Masters and not (neither of both) to the servants themselves, I take it out of all question as cleare as the Sunshine at mid day, that if servants by their Masters command doe any worke on the *Sabbath*, the sinne is not theirs (who as touching their bodily labour are meerely subiect to their Masters power) but it is their Masters sin: for their sin it is, that transgresse the law: they transgresse the law, who are obliged by it: they are obliged by it, to whom it was given and imposed; and given it was as I haue plentifully proved only to Masters.

Or if notwithstanding all these evidences, you will still contend that the prohibition touching bodily labour on the *Sabbath* is directly imposed on the servants themselves, see whether you bring not the Oxe and the Asse and other cattle also vnder the obligation of this commandement, whose worke is immediately after that of servants prohibited, and precisely vnder the same forme of words; whose labours yet on the *Sabbath* I hope you will not say to be in them sinnes and transgressions of Gods law? But as the labour of the beast is the sinne and transgression of the Master, to whom the commandement of the beasts resting from labour was given, so is the labour of the servant also, which by the Masters commandment he executeth on that day (as being touching bodily service incident to mankind in like degree of subiection) the Masters sinne, and not the servants. For di-

1 Joh. 3. 4.

distinction must be made betweene the *matter* and the *forme* (if to speake in schoolmens stile offend you not) that is betweene the *act* and the *guilt* of sinne; of which in this case the *act* indeede, wherewith the commandement of the *Sabbath* is violated, is the servants; but the crime and guiltinesse is the Masters that sets him on worke: For seeing sin *formally* taken is nothing else but the transgression of the law or unlawfulnessse (*ἀνομία* as the Apostle tearmeth it most properly & exactly, even as guiltinesse is the obligation to punishment, for that transgression it appeareth manifestly, that his is the guiltinesse, whose the transgression is; & his the transgression) to whom the law was prescribed as a rule; & that is the masters to whom it is not only imposed that he himselfe should doe no worke on that day as a particular man in the first clause, *Thou shalt doe no worke*; but also that none of his should doe any as he is the Father or master of a family, in those clauses that follow; *Neither shall thy sonne nor thy daughter, nor manservant nor maidservant, &c.* which latter point touching his keeping of the *Sabbath* viz. as the governour of his house, had not bin so well provided for, & regulated by the law of God, if these clauses of children and servants abstinence from labour on the *Sabbath*, had beene given directly to themselves, and not to their governors.

But you will reply perhaps that the commandement touching servants rest on the *Sabbath*, is given to their Masters indeede, but not onely to them,
but

but to their servants also. No such matter: for if it be; let that appeare, and set downe the clause wherein it is manifestly expressed or necessarily implied, that servants are forbidden all labour on the *Sabbath* day, (as servants I say) touching matter of service or labour imposed on them by their Masters: For that in those workes which servants doe on the *Sabbath* day of themselves, & not as proceeding from the masters *injunction*, but from their owne *election*, it is no question but they transgresse the commandement: but those workes they doe not as servants, that is at anothers command; but as in the condition of their service, or favour of their Masters, they retaine some degree of liberty, and haue some disposition of themselves permitted vnto them; so in that respect fall into the clause of free men *viz.* the first clause of the commandement: *Thou shalt doe no worke;* but to servants as servants (in case they be commanded to worke) which is our question, there is no clause of the commandement imposed.

Whereby may easily and clearly be discerned the difference betwixt the equity & wisdom of Almighty God in the constitution of the law of the *Sabbath*, obliging Parents, and masters and owners, for the children, & servants and cattle that are meere vnder their powers; and the rashnesse and iniquity of wretched men interpreting the law as immediately & directly obliging the children & servants themselves: for (good Sir) consider it well, and tell me whether it be more equall to impose the law of ceasing from

worke to the servants themselves, or to their Masters
 in whose power they are? Servants are not *homines*
iuris sui nor *operum suorum Domini* as Lawyers
 speake; they are but their Masters living instruments
~~ἐργαλεία~~ as Aristotle teacheth them; they have
 noe right or power to dispose of themselves; they
 cannot play & worke at their owne pleasure (for this
 is the condition of freemen, not of servants) but are
 meerely and intirely for bodily labour and service
 vnder the power & commandement of their Masters,
 & vnder their power for service only: in such sort as
 they can neither iustly performe any labour, which
 their masters forbid, nor omit any which their ma-
 sters command, but are vnder their inforcement, and
 punishment also if they disobey. This I say is the pro-
 perty and obligation of a servant, and that by the *law*
of nations; which alloweth, and ever hath done, ma-
 sters over their servants (as the law of nature doth pa-
 rents over their children) not only a directive, but a
 correctiue and coactiue power: So then I pray you
 (tell me) whether the commandement touching the
Sabbath was not of common reason, rather to be im-
 posed on them which were at liberty, and had power
 to obey it, then on them which were vtterly void and
 destitute of that power, and liberty? Whether in such
 a case it were not more reasonable to inioyne the
 masters that they should not command, then inioyne
 the servants not to obey? For the poore servants if
 their masters command them could not chuse but
 worke, the law of nations bound them vnto it, which
 had

had put them vnder their masters power, & inforcement: but the masters might forbear to command; there was no law, that bound them to that, or inioyned them to exact ought of their servants. It was therefore much more agreeable both to the wisdom and iustice of almighty God to impose the commandement rather on the masters then on the servants; for thereby was prevented the disobedience of servants to their masters, & the punishment that might attend on that, and the breach of the *law of nations*, (all which the other had occasioned) and yet the masters were in no sort wronged: for their servants remained in their power, no lesse on the *Sabbath*, then the other sixe common daies; only the Lord did qualify, and determine the act, or execution of that power, on the *Sabbath* day; namely to command their servants cessation from bodily labour, & instead of that to exercise themselves in spirituall workes of holinesse; it was I say (to establish the commandement in such forme) more agreeable to the wisdom, and iustice of God. And was it not also to his goodnesse, and compassion? For say that the commandement touching servants vacation was given to themselves, not to their Masters; should not thereby poore servants (to whom every where else the law of God appeareth milde and pitifull) be intangled with inextricable perplexity? For suppose his Master inioyne him some worke on the *Sabbath* day (covetous Masters may soone doe it) especially if they think that precept touching their servants cessation, not to touch

touch them) or else they may be ignorant of the law of God, (as *Christians* and *Jewes*, may happily serue *Pagans*) Admit I say some Master commands his servant to worke on the *Sabbath*, what should the servant doe? should hee worke? God hath forbidden him; should he not worke? His Master hath commanded him: so the law of God is set at strife with the law of nations; and that poore servant like a Sailor betweene *Scylla* & *Charybdis*, standeth perplexed & afflicted in the midst betweene stripes and sinne: for he must of necessity either disobey Gods commandment, which is sinne; or his Masters, which is attended with stripes. Besides it is absurd that the law of God, should restraine the servant from obeying his master, and yet not restraine the master from commanding his servant vnlawfull things: As it is also another absurdity that that day which by the law giuen was manifestly intended to bring seruants release, and remission of their weekly toile, should by the decree of the law it selfe aboue all other daies breed their greatest perplexities: forasmuch as aboue all other daies (if their masters be not men that feare God) enforced they are (there is no avoidance) to venter either on sinne or stripes; for either God must be disobeyed, and sinne cleaveth to their soules; or their masters, and stripes light vpon their bodies; either they must obey God, and be plagued by men; or obey men, and be condemned by God: you will say it is better to obey God then men; and worse to disobey him that can cast both body and soule into hell, then him

him that can only for a time afflict the body: true, who doubts it? But that is not the point I stand vpon; the point is how it agreeth with the tender goodnesse, and compassion of Almighty God towards poore seruants (whose condition is yet honest and lawfull) to plunge them into such perplexities; as namely to impose on them a commandement, which they can neither keepe nor breake without a mischiefe and inconvenience; neither keepe as the seruants of men, nor breake as they are the seruants of God: neither keepe without sharpe punishment; nor breake without heavy sinne: all which intanglement of seruants, and calumniation against both the justice & mercy of God, is clearly avoided, if the commandement be giuen (as the tenour of it doth simply import) to the Masters, and not to the seruants; which I haue sufficiently proued, both by the evidence of holy scripture, soe to haue beene, and by the evidence and inforcement of reason, that it should be so. And doth not the practice of holy gouernours registred in the Scriptures, declare, that they had the same vnderstanding of the commandement? *Nehemiah*, when he saw among the *Iewes* at *Ierusalem* the *Sabbath* prophaned with treading of wine presses, carrying of burthens, buying and selling, whom reproveth he for it? The seruants by whose imployment and labour these things were done, and the *Sabbath* defiled? No but them vnder whose power the seruants were, the *rulers of Iudah*; and what *rulers*? the *Magistrats* only? Noe such matter; but the *freemen of Iudah*; that

is to say the *Masters* of those *Servants*: for such (namely freemen) the word *תָּרִימ* there vsed doth properly import; not only the *Magistrats* or *rulers* of the commonwealth; for the septuagint which (being themselves Iewes) I hold, best knew the property of their owne language; translate *תָּרִימ* by the greeke word *ἐλευθεροι* which word is properly and directly opposed to *servants*: & euery where almost in the old Testament where the Hebrew word *תָּרִימ* is found (which is knowne, to signify a freeman) and is translated in the greeke *ἐλευθεροι*, it is in the Chalde *תַּרְיִיךְ*, which is manifestly knowen to be the same with the hebrew *תָּרִימ*, but farre more vsuall in the Chaldie tongue. They were the freemen of *Judah* then that by *Nehemiah* were called to account, and reprooued, for the prophanation of the *Sabbath* by those servile labours, which (no question) had beene executed by their seruants; but if the seruants by those labours, had themselves transgressed the commandement, had he not done both justly, to haue made them partakers of the reproofe, who had beene partakers of the sinne? (seeing the Commandement of God lay equall on both) and wisely to; that if he could not restraine the Masters from commanding, yet hee might restraine the seruants from obeying, and so haue two strings to his bow? This *Nehemiah* did not (who vnderstood well the commandement) but rebuked the freemen, or Masters only, and omitted the *servants*; and yet, dealt (you will not deny I am sure) both justly and wisely: for had he done more wisely thinke you to rebuke

buke seruants for not resting on the *Sabbath*, that would haue rested with all their hearts, if they had not beene constrained to worke? Or had hee done more justly to exact that of the seruants which, (for ought that appeareth) the commandement of God exacted not from them? For what worke is it that men are forbidden on the *Sabbath*? Is it not the same that is permitted on the fixe daies, their owne worke? *Thou shalt doe all thy worke* מלאכתך. & is it the seruants worke where about as a seruant he is imployed that neither is vndertaken of himselfe, nor for himselfe? that neither beginneth nor endeth in himselfe; but beginneth in his Masters command, and endeth meerey in his Masters profit; and from beginning to end is performed in his Masters feare? It is manifest that in the accompt of God, it is not; for God beholdeth the heart, and that is a mans owne worke with him, that proceedeth from his owne will. And therefore in *Isaiah*: it is the will that is forbidden, about the prophaning of the *Sabbath*; that which in the law was מלאכתך thy worke is there תפוצר thy will; and that most justly; for the will it selfe indeede is the proper seat and subject of sinne, which essentially is nothing else, but the inordinate, or unruly election, or resolution of the will, varying from the Scripture, or Gods law (for this very election of mans will, is the proper forme of actuall sinne) these outward vnlawfull actions of ours, are but the expressions, or manifestations, or fruits or effects of sinne; sin properly they are not, which hath her residence, and

D 2

inhé-

Isaiah. 58. 12. 13.

inherence in the soule it selfe, and passeth forth of it: only the tincture and euidence & name of sinne they carry with them, because they issue from a sinfull determination of the will; and are no whit further sinful then they are voluntary. Seeing therefore sinne consisteth especially in the exorbitance of the will, they that are only ministers of anothers exorbitant will, are only ministers of another mans sinne, which so farre only becommeth their owne sinne, as their owne will concurrerth therevnto. The servant therefore doeing that worke on the *Sabbath* day in obedience to his Master, which of his owne will and election he would not doe, although the worke whereby the commandement of God is transgressed, be in some sort his, yet the transgression is none of his, but his Masters, that exacted the worke; so that although the worke as *naturally* considered be the servants, yet morally it is the Masters; The labour of it is the servants, but the sinne of it is the Masters: for the sinne is not in the servants obedience to the Masters commandement, but in the Masters disobedience to Gods commandmēt; which hath indeede prohibited the worke of servants in the Sabbath, but yet the prohibition is imposed, and directed to their Masters not to them, who are onely ministers, not authors of their owne labours; now in the imputation of sinne, difference is to be made betwixt the *authors* and the *ministers*; Betwixt the *principall*, & *instrumentall* agents: For is it the sinne of the eye when it beholdeth vanity, and of the tongue when it is loose to blaspheme, slander, ly?

ly: or of the hand when it is stretched forth to strike, and shed blood? They may be tearmed the finnes of these members I confesse, because in these finnes, these members are abused; but are these workes properly the finnes of these instruments, or of the dissolute minde? of those subordinate Ministers, and servants of the soule, that performe their naturall obedience? or of the inordinate soule herselfe that misgoverneth them? But you may object, that these are naturall instruments, in the workes of the soule, and conferre only power, but the seruant is a voluntary instrument in the workes of his Master and conferreth also will: I answere; he conferreth will indeede if he be a good seruant, by reason of the obligation of obedience wherein he standeth to his Master; but yet not absolute but conditionall will: not the selfe-election, but onely the obedience and yeelding of his will; and that onely as it is his Masters worke: not as it is his Masters sinne: for the worke on the *Sabbath*, hauing sinne annexed to it, and so being a sinfull worke, the seruant and the Master must diuide it betwixt them: the worke is the seruants, and the sinne is the Masters; for the seruant doth but his duty, in obeying his Masters commandement, but the Master transgresseth his, in disobeying Gods commandement, touching his seruants ceasing from that labour: But seeing I haue begunne to object I will proceede a little farther in that course, both the more euidently to declare my meaning, least it be obnoxious to calumniation, & also to resolueth the objections that may be produced against

servants obedience touching worke on the *Sabbath* if my imagination bee so good as to finde them, & my learning also to satisfy them. For first, it seemes that servants are touching this commandement in better condition then other men: if by their workes on the *Sabbath* they transgresse it not: and transgresse it they doe not if it be not imposed on them, but onely on their Masters. Touching them I answered that the workes of servants are of two sorts; some proceeding from them as they are servants that is vpon their Masters commandement: others proceeding from their owne election: unto which namely not by any commandement of their Masters, but by the way of their owne desires they are carried. Of the first sort of workes they are only Ministers, of the second they are authors. And touching this second sort I confesse (although of the former it be farre otherwise) both that servants haue a seuerall obligation of their owne; and that their transgression and sinne is seuerall, & therefore that themselues are bound to answer it to the justice of God; but whether the sinne of these second workes, be peculiarly the servants, or that the Master also participates with the servant in that guiltinesse, It may be a question, for if they be done meere by the servants election (beside the knowledge and contrary to the commandement of his Master) it seemes to bee particularly the servants sinne: But if they be occasioned by the Masters negligence, then doth he certainly participate in guiltinesse with his servant, although in a diuerse sort; for it is a sinne of commission
in the

in the seruant doing an vnlawfull act, and a sinne of omiſſiō in the Maſter neglecting his due care; becauſe by the precept of Almighty God the Maſter is bound not onely to command his ſeruant to worke, but to command him not to worke on the *Sabbath* day: well then the workes which ſeruants doe on the *Sabbath* day on their owne election are condemned: the workes they doe by obedience, are excuſed by their Maſters commandement. But what workes are ſo excuſed? Are all? No; but briefly all thoſe which while they are performed as by the Seruants of men, they that doe them are not impeached for being the ſeruants of God: That is to ſay the workes of *labour* but not the workes of *ſin*: for to the firſt they are obliged by the law of *nations*; but the ſecond are forbidden them by the law of God; not nakedly forbidden as their labour on the *Sabbath* is, but *directly* and *immediatly* forbidden them; for it is cleare that all the other commandements being indifferently impoſed without either ſpecification or exception of any perſon whatſoeuer, reſpect not any more one then another: and therefore hold all men vnder an equall obligation; and ſo was it altogether convenient; becauſe they are no leſſe the ſecret lawes of nature, then the reuealed lawes of God: and no leſſe written with the finger of God in the fleſhly tables of the heart, then in the tables of ſtone; all of them forbidding thoſe things that by their property and nature, or (as the Schoolemen ſay) *ex ſuo genere*, are euill; but the commandement that forbiddeth ſeruile workes on the
Sab-

Sabbath is of a different sort; first because the servant is, touching the matter which it forbiddeth (*labour*) wholly subject to another mans command: secondly because the commandement forbiddeth not the servant to worke, but onely forbiddeth the Master his seruants worke; thirdly because the thing it selfe namely seruants labour, is not euill materially and *ex suo genere*, as the matters of the other negative commandements are: but only circumstantially, because its done vpon such a day: for idolatry, blasphemy, dishonouring of Parents, murther, adultery, theft, false testimony, coueting of that is other mens; which are the matter of other commandements are euill in their owne nature; and therefore forbidden, because they are euill in their owne nature: But to labour on the *Sabbath* is not by nature euill, but therefore euill because it is forbidden. So that the natieue ilnesse in the other, causeth the prohibition, but the prohibition in this causeth the euill; for labouring on the seaventh day, if God had not forbidden it had not beene euill at all (no more then to labour on the *sixt*;) as not being interdicted by any law of nature, as the matters of all the other commandements are: for although the secret instinct of nature teacheth all men, that some-time is to be withdrawen from their bodily labours, and to be dedicated to the honour of God (whiche euen the prophanest Gentiles, amidst all the blind superstition, and darkenesse, wherewith they were couered, in some sort did) appointing set times to be spent in sacrifice and deuotion to their Idols which,

which they tooke for their Gods) yet to obserue one day in the number of seauen, as a certaine day of that number, and namely the seauenth in the ranke, or a whole day by the revolution of the Sunne, and with that seuerely exactnesse of restraining all worke (as was enioyned to the Iewes) is but meere ceremonyall, brought in by positieue law; and is not of the law of nature. For had that forme of keeping the *Sabbath*, beene a law of nature, then had it obliged the *Gentiles* as well as the *Iewes*; seeing they participate both equally in the same nature: yet it did not so; but was giuen to the *Israelites*, to be a speciall marke of their separation from the *Gentiles*, and of their particular Consecration to God: neither shall wee finde either in the writings of Heathen men (whereof some were in their kinde very religious) that any of them had euer any sense of it; or in the records of *Moses*, that it was euer obserued by any of the holy *Patriarches* before it was pronounced in mount *Sinai*: But if it had beene a law of nature her selfe, and so had obliged all the *Patriarches*; and as large as nature her selfe, and so obliged all the *Gentiles*; and had it not beene as durable, as nature too, and so obliged vs *Christians* also? Certainly it had; for if that precise vacation and sanctification of the *Sabbath* day, had consisted by the law of nature, then must it haue beene by the decree of all Diuines immutable; and consequently right grievous should the sinne of *Christians* bee, which now prophane that day with ordinary labours; & chiefly theirs, which first translated the celebration

E

Exod. 31. 13.
Ezech. 20. 12.
20.

bration of that day, being the seauenth, to the first day of the weeke; who yet are certainly supposed to be none other then the Apostles of our Saviour:

To turne to the point and clearly to determine it; the Master only is accountable vnto God, for the seruants worke done on the *Sabbath*: but for what worke? Namely for all the workes of labour, but not for the workes of sinne: and how for the workes of labour? Namely, if he doe them not absolutely, of his owne election, but respectiueley, as of obedience to his Masters command; for touching labours, seruants are directly obliged to their Masters, but touching finnes, themselves are obliged immediatly to God. Therefore those they may doe because their Masters commands them: these they may not doe (although commanded) because God forbids them.

The seruants then may not in any case, sinne at the commandement of any Master on earth: because hee hath receiued immediatly a direct commandement to the contrary, from his Master in heauen. For it is better to obey God then man. And there is no proportion betwixt the duties which they owe as seruants to their Masters according to the flesh; And which they owe as *Children* to the father of spirits: or betwixt the obligation wherein they stand to men, who haue power but ouer their bodies in limited cases, and that for a season, And that infinite obligation wherein they stand to him that is both creator and preseruer, and redeemer, & Iudge of body and soule; sinne therefore they may not, if their *Masters* command

mand them, because God hath forbidden them (not only forbidden I say, but forbidden it them) But labour they may if their Masters command them, because God hath no way forbidden them that; God hath indeede forbidden the Masters *exacting* that worke on the *Sabbath*; but he hath not forbidden the seruants *execution* of that worke if it be demanded or exacted: he hath restrained the Master from commanding it, but he hath not restrained the seruants from obeying if it be commanded; for although I acknowledge the seruants worke on the *Sabbath* to imply sinne: yet I say it is not the seruants fault. And albeit I confesse the commandement of God be transgressed and God disobeyed by such workes on the *Sabbath*, yet it is not the seruant that transgresseth the commandemēt; it is not he that disobeyeth God. For the question is not of the *passive* sense, whether God be displeased with these workes, but of the *active* who displeaseth him: The thing is confessed but the person is questioned: Confessed, that is, that there is sinne committed in that worke; but questioned whose sinne it is. For worke hauing relation both to the Master and to the seruant: to the Masters commanding and to the seruants executing; I affirme that the worke is sinfull only on the Masters part, not on the seruants; namely as it is an effect of the Masters command, not as an effect of the seruants obedience. And the case seemes cleare. The matter whereabout the seruants labour is, is the Masters: So is the command that sets him to it: So is the awe and feare that

keepes him to it. So is the profit that redoundeth of it: And aboue all the commandement of God whereby that worke of the seruant is forbidden is giuen directly to the Master. And in the seruant all is contrary. It is not his owne worke: It proceedeth not from his owne will: His condition exacteth his obedience about labour; and aboue all Gods command of ceasing from labour belongeth not to him; I meane not to him directly, as the *person*, to whom it is giuen, but only as the subject or *matter* whereof it is giuen; for he is one of them indeede, *whose workes* are forbidden, but not of them *to whom* it is forbidden; one of *whom* but not *to whom* the commandement was imposed. But where the law was not imposed, sinne cannot bee imputed, seeing sinne is nothing but the transgression of the law; it is not therefore the seruants but the Masters sinne.

But there is another objection; for admit the seruants worke vpon the *Sabbath* be the Masters sinne, that imposeth it. Is it not sinne to giue consent and furtherance to another mans sinne? But this seruants doe when they execute their Masters commandements, and consequently it is vnlawfull so to yeeld; lawfull therefore it is to resist and reject such commandement. I answer first touching the point of consenting, that in such a worke is to be considered the *substance* and the *quality*, that is the worke it selfe & the sinfulness of it; seruants may consent to it, as it is their Masters *worke*, not as it is their Masters *sinne*; for except these things be distinguished, God him-
selfe

selfe can no more auoide the calumniation of being the author, then poore seruants of being the ministers of sinne; for that God concurrerh with euery man to euery action whatsoeuer, as touching the substance of the action, is out of all question; seeing both all power whence actions issue are deriued from him, & that no power can proceede into act without his present assistance and operation; but yet to the *crime*, the *faultinesse*, the *inordination*, the *unlawfulnesse* of the action (wherein the nature of sinne doth formally consist) he concurrerh not; But it wholly proceedeth from the infection of concupiscence, wherewith the faculties of the soule are originally defiled; the actions themselues issuing from the powers, and the sinfulness of the actions from the sinfulness of the powers, like corrupt streames flowing from filthie springs. It is not therefore euery concurrence of the seruants with the Master to a sinfull action which causeth the staine, and imputation of sinne vpon the seruant: as when he consenteth and concurrerh onely to the action not to the sinne: namely likes and approues it, as his Masters worke, yet utterly dislikes it, as it is his Masters transgression; likes of the worke for the obligation of obedience, wherein (touching worke) he standeth to serue his Master; and yet dislikes of the sinne, for the greater obligation wherein euery one standeth toward the honour of God. But yet (to answer secondly to the point of resisting) the seruant ought not for any dislike or detestation of the annexed sinne, to resist or reject his

Masters commandement touching the worke: for in obeying he is at most but the Minister of another mans sinne (and that as they say *per accidens*, namely as it is annexed to such a worke) but in resisting he is directly the author of his owne sinne, by withdrawing his obedience about bodily seruice from him that is his Lord according to the flesh: euen that obedience wherein both by his owne couenant and the law of nations he standeth bound vnto him, and that without any exception of the *Sabbath* more then other dayes. And is it wisdom in a seruant to commit himselfe sinne to preuent his Masters sinne? That is to offend God himselfe least another man should offend him; no not so; wee must not doe euill that good may come thereof (especially doe euill our selues that anothers good may come of it) rather wee must carry two eyes about vs that while wee looke with one to the end (that is to the glory of God,) we looke with another to the means that they be lawfull and agreeable to the will of God; and not dishonour him with our sinfull actions, while we would honour him with our good intentions. But yet one scruple remaineth because euery person that did any worke on the *Sabbath* day, was by the law to be *cut off from his people, and to dye the death*, euery person therefore, the seruant as well as the Master. I answered that the *indiciall* commandement is to be vnderstood of the same persons to whom the *morall* commandement was giuen; the commandement touching *punishment*, of them, to whom the commandement touching

touching the *offence* was imposed: but I proued before that the morall commandement was not imposed to servants as servants, but to them that were at liberty. All they therefore that did any worke on the *Sabbath* were to dy the death by the Iudiciall law: they I say that did it: not they that were made to doe it; which were as well passiue as actiue in doing of it: namely they that did it of election, as free, that might abstaine from worke and would not; not they that did it of iniunction and necessity, as servants that would abstaine from worke and might not; whose condition was such that if they would not worke by their masters direction, might be made to worke by their masters compulsion; for a hard case it were if poore servants to whom no commandement to cease from worke was giuen by God, and yet might bee compelled to worke by men, should dye for it, if they did so worke. It is therefore to be vnderstood of them that worke willingly of themselues or (as *authors*) cause others to worke (as masters doe their servants) not of them who only (as *ministers*) and against their wills are set to worke. And rather because the worke of the servant (that I say which hee doth by the commandement of his master to whom for matter of labour he is meerely subordinate) euen reason and equity will interpret the masters worke. And certainly that God accounteth it so, the declaration of that precept in another place doth make manifest. *Sixe daies thou shalt doe thy worke, and the seauenth day thou shalt rest that thine Oxe and thine*
Ass

Exod. 23. 12.

Asse, and thy Sonne, and thy Maide, &c. may be refreshed; for is it not manifest that the seruants worke is accounted the Masters, seeing the rest from the Masters worke is the refreshing of the seruants: the Master therefore who by the morall law was commanded that his seruants should not worke on the *Sabbath*, was by the Iudiciall to bee punished with death, if the seruant did worke that day by his commandement.

And thus haue I proued my assertion; namely that the commandement of the *Sabbath* was not giuen, nor fit to be giuen to the seruants themselues, but to their gouernour; both by arguments of reason which is the rule of men, and authority of Scriptures, which is the rule of *Christians*; and cannot finde any thing materiall in either of both that may reprove it: but yet if I should admit (which I doubt you will neuer proue) that the commandement was directly giuen to seruants themselues, as seruants; and that they might lawfully disobey their Masters touching those workes whereby the precept of the *Sabbath* might be transgressed: yet haue I another exception against your doctrine; namely for condemning every light worke (such as inviting of guests, or fetching of wine from a neighbours house, or giuing a horse prouender) (for these are the very instances which bred the question) for transgression of Gods Commandements, forbidden on the *Sabbath*: no; it is not; the commandement importeth no such thing; for it is not [מעשה] that is euery worke, but [מלאכה] that is

is there forbidden; that is every servile work; for such the word [מלאכה] properly doth import; and servile worke, by the interpretation of the best divines is accounted, either that which is attended with the toile of the body, or at least intended and directed to lucre and gaine of riches, with some care of the minde, such as mens ordinary worke is wont to bee on common daies. And that the worke there forbidden hath a speciall relation to the gaine of riches is the better apparent because the same word [מלאכה] signifieth (*opes*) as well as (*opus*), riches as well as worke; and not only where the commandement was pronounced (in the 20 of *Exodus*) but wheresoever it is repeated in the bookes of the law, which is oftentimes (and differently for other circumstances) the same word [מלאכה] is euer retained and never changed; not every worke therefore absolutely, but every worke of such a kind, namely consisting in toile and tending to gaine is restrained by the commandement; and is there not evident reason to vnderstand it so? For seeing the intendment of the precept is clearly (in the point of that daies vacation) that the body should bee refreshed by abstinence from labour, And (in the point of sanctification of it) the minde should be refreshed by attendance to spirituall exercise; it followeth manifestly that if there be any works that resolue not the body and so hinder not the refreshing of it; nor dissolue and alienate the minde from the service of God, and meditation of Godlinessse, that these workes are not forbidden; because

F

neither

neither the vacation which the commandement importeth, nor that sanctification which it intendeth is impeached by them.

Exod 35.3.

a Luk. 13.15.

b Luk. 6.

c Ioh. 9.6.

And if you will object that euen very light works are expressely forbidden in the law, so that to kindle fire on the *Sabbath* day was vnlawfull, I must answere you that that and some other were but ceremoniall precepts not morall (and belonged to the curious observance of the commandement) and therefore obliged the Iewes and none else: for that such light and labourlesse workes on the *Sabbath* were no transgression at all of the morall commandement the practise of him whose every action was our instruction, of him who was the giuer of the law as God, and the only keeper of it as man, will put all out of question; for had that exact and extreame vacation on the *Sabbath* beene required by Gods morall commandement, and so every light worke beene a transgression of it, would not our Saviour haue reprobued the Iewes ^a for loosing their beasts from the staules, and leading them to water on the *Sabbath* day? Yet hee mentioneth, and reprobues it not: (and thinke Sir by the way) hee that condemned not bringing of beasts to drinke, would not condemne bringing meate to beasts: or would he haue (not suffered onely) but excused the ^b plucking of eares of corne, and rubbing out the graines on the *Sabbath* day as hee did in his disciples? or would he himselfe ^c on the *Sabbath* day haue made clay, and anointed with it the eyes of the blinde? or would he haue commanded others to doe
such

such workes on the *Sabbath*, as hee did the impotent man, whom he had healed; namely to ^dtake vp his ^dbed that day and depart? See then how this severe precisenesse of yours agreeth with the practise and doctrine of our Saviour; who not only suffered these light workes to bee done without reprehension, but excused them; but did them himselfe; but commanded others to doe them: therefore in his iudgement, who was the law-giuer, and must bee the Iudge of all the finnes of men; they were no transgression of the commandement of the *Sabbath*.

For vaine it were to reply that Christ was Lord of the *Sabbath*, and therefore might dispense with the commandement at his owne pleasure: vaine it were, I say; for although hee were Lord of the *Sabbath* as God, being so the law-giuer, yet was hee subiect to the commandement, as man; being as the Apostle faith * *made vnder the law*; for what else importeth that kinde of speech (*made vnder the law*) but that he which by nature was not vnder the law, as being God, was yet made vnder the law as becomming man: which law first himselfe pronounced, hee came to fulfill; and secondly his Apostles that hee had fulfilled it in that he had no sinne: but every transgression of the law was sinne, therefore in no sort he transgressed the law: and it not onely were vaine in this manner to excuse our Saviours actions, but a very hard and dangerous point, when question is made of our Saviours fulfilling of the law, to fly in this case to the refuge of dispensations: as if our Saviour that

* Galat. 4. 4.

Matth. 5. 17.

came to satisfy for all our transgressions of the Law, performed not the law himselfe, with such perfect & exact obedience as might answer the justice of God, and the strictnesse of his commandements, but that something must bee helped or supplied by dispensation. The truth is therefore that our Saviours obedience, answered exactly, and perfectly satisfied the exigence of that, and all other commandements of Almighty God, performing all to the utmost that they required, and therefore those easie and slender works, were no breaches of the commandement touching the *Sabbath*.

But let that bee admitted also; first that the commandement was immediatly giuen to servants; Secondly that it was giuen touching the lightest degree of workes. Let servants bee the persons, and those workes the matter to whom, and of which the commandement was giuen; is your doctrine yet justified hereby, and subiect to no other reproofe? The persons haue afforded me exceptions against it, because the commandement was not giuen to servants: And the matter, because it was not imposed touching that light sort of workes; the time also will, because it cannot be vnderstood of the Lords day; for what day was it, of which the charge of vacation was so strictly giuen? Was it not the seauenth day of the weeke? The seauenth (saith the precept) is the *Sabbath* of the Lord thy God; *In it thou shalt doe no worke*. And why the seauenth? Because in six daies the Lord finished all the workes of creation, and rested the seauenth day

day; therefore he sanctified the seauenth day; & what day is it whereof we question? The Lords day: That is the first day of the weeke: It is therefore the seauenth day of the week (*the Sabbath of the Iewes*) not the first day of the week, the *Sabbath* of Christians that was so strict'y by Gods cōmandement destined to rest. Therefore the works done on the *Sabbath* day are no transgressions of Gods commandement. But you will say, the old *Sabbath* is abolished, and the celebration of it translated to the first day of the week: Translated, by whom? By any commandement of God? Where is it? The holy Scripture we know to be sufficient; it containeth all the commandements of God, whether of things to be done, or to be avoided, or to be belceued. Let mee heare either one precept, one word of God out of the old Testament that it should be translated, or one precept, one word of the sonne of God, out of the new Testament, commanding it to bee translated, I say one word of any of his Apostles intimating that by Christs commandement it was translated: It is certaine that there is none. Therefore it is evident that the solemnity of the Lords day was not established *Iure divino*: Not by any commandement of God; and consequently that to worke on that day, is certainly no breach of any divine commandement. How then hath the first day of the weeke gained the celebration and solemnity to become the *Sabbath* of the Christians? By the constitution of the Church; and only by that; yet of that most ancient Church, I confesse, that next followed

the ascension of our redeemer. But yet all this is but *Ius humanum* it is but the decree of men, which must not equall it selfe with Gods commandement, and must be content with a lesse degree of authority and obligation then the commandement touching the *Sabbath*, might challenge that was pronounced in the eares of men with the voice of God, and written in tables with the finger of God. What then doe I doubt of the iust abolishment of the *Jews Sabbath*? No in no sort; it is abolished and that iustly I confesse; yet not by any repeale of any contrary decree; but onely by expiration, because it is growne out of date; It was established for a signe * of difference betwixt the people of God and the prophane nations, the *Jewes* and *Gentiles*: but this difference is ceased, the *partition wall* is broken downe, *Jewes & Gentiles* in Christ are made all one: all are become the people of God; the *Sabbath* was (saith the Apostle) a shadow * of things to come, whereof the body was in Christ; the body therefore being come, what should the shadow be respected? For was it the shadow of Christs resting in the graue that day? *That is past*; or was it a shadow of rest and liberty from the slavery of sinne in the kingdome of grace? *that is obtained*; or is it a shadow of eternall rest of the blessed in the kingdome of Glory: *That is sure to be obtained*. (Christ hath given his word, and wee haue receaued the pledge of his holy spirit) These things are shadowed in the *Sabbath*: And these things are already performed in Christ: *The first is past, the second is present, the third*

Exod. 31. 13.

Ezech. 20. 12.

Colos. 2. 17.

third is assured. The *Sabbath* therefore that was the shadow of these things, when the things themselves were come, vanished of it selfe. But might not the celebration of the *Sabbath*, which thus ceased, bee justly translated by the Church to the first day of the weeke? Yes certainly both might, & was iustly. For I consider that the *generality*, was of the morall law, of the law of nature; namely that men should sequester some time from worldly affaires, which they might dedicate to the honour of God; onely the *speciality*, that is the limitation and designement of that time, was the churches ordinance, appointing first one certaine day, & that in relation to Christian assemblies; namely that they might meet and pray, and praise God together with one voice in the congregation. And secondly designing that one day to the first day of the weeke, for some speciall reasons and remembrances. For first it was the day of *Christs* resurrection from the dead. Secondly it was the day of the holy Ghosts descention from heaven to powre infinite graces vpon Christians. The first of them for our iustification as the Apostle speaketh. The second for the sanctification, and edification of the whole Church; (to omit some other reasons of lesse importtance) iustly therefore was the consecration of the *Sabbath* translated to that day. But what of that? What if the consecration of the *Sabbath* was by the Church translated to the first day of the weeke? Was therefore the commandement of God translated also? That that day ought to be obserued vnder the same obligation with

with the *Sabbath*? For if the commandement of God were not translated by the Church, together with the celebration from the seauenth day to the first day, then is working on the first day no violation of Gods commandement; was the commandement of God then translated from the *Sabbath* to the Lords day by the decree of the Church? No: the Church did it not, let me see the Act. The Church could not doe it, let me see the authority: the Church could not translate the commandement to the first day, which God himselfe had namely limited to the seauenth. For could the Church make that Gods commandement which was not his commandement? Gods commandement was to rest on the seauenth day and worke on the first; therefore to rest on the first and worke on the seauenth was not his commandement: For doth the same commandement of God enioyne both labour and rest on the same day? Is there fast and loose in the same commandement with God? Thou shalt worke on the first day saith that; and worke on the seauenth, saith this. Can the Church make these the same commandement? But say the Church hath this incredible & vnconceiuable power: Say it may forbid to worke on the first day, by the vertue of the very same precept, that doth neither expressly cōmand or license to worke on that day. Say that the Church of God may translate the commandement of God from one day to another at their pleasure, did they it therefore? I spake before of their authority whether they might doe it: I enquire now
of

of the act, whether they did it; did the Church (I say) ever constitute, that the same obligation of Gods commandement which lay on the *Jewes*, for keeping of the *Sabbath* day, should be translated and laid vpon the Christians for keeping of the Lords day? Did the Church this? No no, they did it not; all the wit & learning in the World will not proue it.

But you may obiekt, if the old *Sabbath* vanished & the commandement of God was limited & fixed to that day only, then is one of Gods commandements perished. I answered that the *generality* of that commandement to keepe a *Sabbath* wherein God might be honoured, was morall; But the *speciality* of it, namely to keepe, (1) one day of seaven; (2) the seaventh; (3) one whole day; (4) with precise vacancy from all work, were meerely ceremoniall; the *specialities* then of the commandements are vanished; But for the generality of it, it is a law of nature, and remaineth. But, as the speciality of that commandement implyeth plaine contradictiō, with the sabbaticall of the Lords day, so the generality of it can enforce nothing for it; for these are miserable consequents, (indeede plaine fallacies of the consequent) that God hath sometime commanded vacancy for his honour, therefore he hath commanded the first day of the weeke to be that time; or this, God hath commanded vs some time to rest, therefore that time we must precisely abstaine frō all māner of workes: can the Church make these consequences good? If it cannot, the celebration of the Lords day, can with

no enforcement of reason be deduced out of the morality of Gods commandement. But if you will reply: that the Church hath established the first day of the weeke to be the Christians *Sabbath* not by way of consequence, as deducing it out of the cōmandement; but meerely by authority, appropriating and fixing Gods morall commandement to it; you may say your pleasure, but I shall neither belecue, nor you proue that such authority belongs to the Church: or that such an act hath beene established by the Church: which I am sure you can neuer doe; nether of both; for seeing that all divines acknowledge that the singling out of such a day to be sanctified (namely the seventh rather then any other) was meerely ceremoniall, although it was Gods owne designation, I hope that you will confesse the speciall designement of the first day of the weeke to that honour, before other daies, being made only by the Church to bee also but ceremoniall. But certainly it is that no ceremonies, which come not vnder the obligation of Gods morall law, should oblige to the obseruation of ceremonies. Therefore it will never consist with reason, that the morall law of God can by any authority of the Church oblige Christians to the celebration of the Lords day.

It is not therefore the translation of the old commandement of God from the one day to the other (which yet if it were translated) can oblige seruants; (no otherwise then it did vnder the old law) but the institution of a new commandement, of the Church
her

her selfe (yet guided by the spirit of God) that consecrated that day to the solemne service of God; what then? Doth not the constitution of the Church, for the celebration of the Lords day, bind equally the conscience of men as the old commandement did, for the celebration of the *Sabbath*? Binde it doth, but not equally: for the Church is no way equall vnto God; the authority of it is lesse then the authority of God, therefore is the obligation of the Churches ordinance, lesse then the obligation of Gods ordinance. But yet binde the conscience it doth, and that firmly & effectually, (even the conscience of every member of the Church) to true and exact obedience. For he *that heareth not the Church is no better then an heathen or a publican.* And never was Church on earth more vndefiled then that that ordained that institution. He that despiseth the Apostles of Christ despiseth Christ himselfe, and the Apostles were governours of that Church: for acknowledged it is that the celebration of the Lords day, was the ordinance of that Church and of those governours. Therefore it is sure that that ordinance doth oblige the conscience of euery Christian man; but if you aske me how farre doth that constitutiō of the Church oblige the conscience? I answer you, as farre as it doth command; (you will desire no more) further it cannot: It cannot oblige further, then it doth ordaine; it cannot bind the conscience for guiltinesse, further then it doth for obedience; because all guiltinesse doth presuppose disobedience; now that the Church or-

Mat. 18. 17.

dained solemn assemblies of Christians, to be celebrated that day to the honour of God, and in them the invocation of Gods holy name, thanksgiving, hearing of the holy Scriptures and receiuing of the Sacraments, is not denied; It is out of question; all antiquity affordeth plentiful remembrance of it. But that it inioyneth that severe & exact vacation, frō all workes on the Lords day, which the commandement of God requireth in the *Iewes sabbath*, you will never proue. It relisheth too much of the *Iewish* ceremonies, to be proved by Christian divinity. For this is no prooffe of it, that the Lords day is succeeded in place of the Sabbath. Or as some divines tearme it, as the heyre of the *Sabbath*. It is I say no prooffe at all; (except it were established by the same authority, & the obseruance of it, charged with the same strictnesse of commandement:) for if it succede the *Sabbath* in place, must it therefore succeed in equall precisenesse of observation? (So if the Pope succeedeth *Peter* in place, must he therefore succeed him in equality of power?) the Lords day therefore succeedeth the *sabbath* in the point of sanctification, for celebration of the assemblies; for the Church hath precisely commanded that; but not in the point of exact and extreame vacation, from every kinde of worke; for that the Church hath not commanded: and so although the Lords day may well be tearmed the heire of the *sabbath*; yet is it not *ex affe heres* as the civill lawyers speake: it inheriteth not the whole right of the *Sabbath*, for that right and prerogative of the *sabbath*

sabbath was not giuen to the *Sabbath* & its heirs; it was was no fee simple; (and if I may speake in the lawyers stile) it was only a tenure for tearme of life: namely during the life of the ceremoniall law, which life ended in the death of our Saviour. This reason therefore of the succession of the Lords day in place of the *sabbath* is no reason. Any other reason besides this, or else authority which I might in your behalfe obiekt to my selfe, I know none worthy mentioning: for the commandement of God as I haue proued is not of this day; the commandement of the Church is of this day, but not of these workes; neither will all the histories of the ancient Church, nor canons of the ancient councells, nor any other monuments or registers of antiquity afford you (as I am certainly perswaded search them as curiously as you can) record of any such constitutions of the Church for the generall restraint of workes on the Lords day; you may find I know in some of the ancient Fathers much founding to the prerogatiue of that day: as that it was a *holy day* in ^a *Eusebius*: a *day of Christian assemblies* in ^b *Iustin Martyr*; and a *day of reioycing* in ^c *Tertullian*: a *festiuall day* in ^d *Ignatius*; & some more of the like; but doth any of all these import or imply a generall restraint? A distance from all worke? No, they doe not; neither shall you finde in these, nor in any other records of antiquity any constitutions of the Apostles, and of the first Church extant to that effect; no nor any relation or remembrance that such a constitution had ever beene made by them:

^a Hist. Eccles.
lib. 4. cap. 22.
^b Apolog. 2.
^c Apolog. c. 16.
^d Epi. ad mag.

Cod. lib. 3. Tit.
12. leg. 3.

Council. Laod.
Can. 29.

Si modo possint.

Nay I finde cleare evidence to the contrary: for would *Constantine* the Great (that most holy Emperour and the best nursing father of Christian religion that euer Prince was) would he I say haue licensed by his decree, the country people freely (*libere licentia*; are the words of the constitution) to attend their sowing of graine, setting of vines and other husbandry on the Lords day, if those workes had beene forbidden by the commandement of God, or decree of the Apostles, and first Church? Or would the Fathers in the councell of *Laodicea* (one of the most ancient & approued councells of the Church) enioyne the vacancy of the Lords day with this condition; *And if men can*: Certainly servants full ill can, if they be constrained by their Masters to worke: would they I say haue added such a condition, had it beene simply vnlawfull, for all sorts of people by the ancient Sanction of the first Church to doe any worke that day? It appeareth therefore that there were no such vniversall constitutions of the Church. The actuall forbearing of all workes by some Christians that day I stand not on: nor on the exhortations of some ancient Fathers to that purpose; some remembrances of both are to be found I know; but these are *particular examples*, and perswasions; *constitutions* of the Church they are not; edicts of sundry Princes likewise, and decrees of some provinciall Councells are extant I confesse in record to the same effect, and those are constitutions indeede; but partly, not of the Church; partly not vniversall,
nor

nor very ancient, and therefore are no Sanctions to oblige the whole Church, which, beside the law of God and decrees of the Apostles (to whom the government of the whole Church by our Saviour was committed) and the canons of the vniversall *Synods* no positie constitution can doe. What then? Would I set at liberty that euery man may freely prophane the Lords day with extraordinary labour? No; I would not; I confesse it is meete Christians should abandon all worldly affaires that day and dedicate it wholly to the honour of God; that Christians should not be lesse devout & religious in celebrating of the Lords day, then the *Iewes* were in celebrating of their *Sabbath*; for the obligation of our thankfulness to God is more then theirs, although the obligation of his commandement to vs in that behalte is lesse; Meete it is I say; And wish with all my heart it were most religiously performed euen with all abstinence from worldly affaires, and all attendance to Godly devotion. But yet notwithstanding I deny that together with the institution of the Lords day there was any such cōstitutiō of the Church established whereby men were obliged to the strict desisting from all worke. But what doth the honour of God then stand at the curtesie of man to prophane that day (if they list) with worke at their pleasure? Not so; for beside the constitutions of some ancient councells, the edicts of Christian Princes haue every where restrained that prophanation: neither of which (for matters that fall vnder their power) can be transgressed without

without sinne and disobedience to God, whose commandements although not *directly* yet *reductively*) those constitutions are: for God hath commanded all men to honour their Parents (the parents of their country stand in the first ranke:) The sonne of God hath commanded all Christians to heare the Church, and that vnder forfeiture of communion of Saints; but they that despise the Canons of the Church, or edicts of the Prince, heare not the one; honour not the other; therefore they that transgresse either of these constitutions, transgresse also (Consequently I say though not immediatly) the commandements of God; but yet neither of them both (to come nearer home) are transgressed by servants if they worke by their Masters commission, and not of their owne election; for neither doth the one law or the other giue liberty and warrant to Servants to be rebellious to their Masters touching point of service, that day more thē others: but in forbidding of work, first they intend not your precise abstinence from any light and labourlesse worke as both the censure of the Church, and iudgement of temporall Magistrates make manifest, which neuer tooke hold on any man for such manner of workes: And secondly they purpose to forbid the Masters commanding or allowing of worke and not the servants obeying if he be commanded; for the law is intended and taketh hold of them that haue the liberty & power to keepe it, not of them that haue not, but are meerely vnder the power and disposition of another man; wherefore if
servants

Servants worke on the Lords day of their owne choice, it is their owne sinne; but if their Masters command, it is their masters sinne; And he standeth bound to answer the law. No warrant therefore, nor encouragement haue servants by any of these lawes, to reject their commandements touching matter of worke or service on the *Sabbath* or any other day.

And is not this more agreeable to the doctrine of the holy Apostles of our Saviour, every where delivered touching servants? Doe they not often, and with exceeding earnestnes cōmand and exhort them to obedience; no where permitting them any point of liberty, and that without exception of Master, of labour, or of time? for (that we may take a very short view of their doctrine touching servants obedience) what Masters are they to whom servants ought to be obedient? *Infidells and beleeuers* saith *Paul 1. Tim. 6. 1. 2. Covetous* and *fromard* saith *Peter 1. Pet. 2. 18.* that is, even to all; obedient to all. How? In what sort? *From the heart* saith the Apostle, *Coloss. 3. 23. in singlenesse of heart as vnto Christ* in another place: *Ephes. 6. 5. without any replying, not so much as answering againe.* In a third. *Titus. 29.* That is in all readinesse and humility; obedient to all in such sort: how farre? In what points? Even in all things: *servants be obedient to your Masters in all things. Coloss. 3. 22. please them in all things, Titus 2. 9. thinke them worthy of all honour. 1, Tim. 6. 1.* In all things? Yea in all things belonging to the condition of Servants; that is in all service, in all labour which is the proper
H character

character of all servants, and (obedient to them in all things) why? *That the name of God and his doctrine be not evil spoken of, 1. Tim. 6. 1.* which two last points of the Apostles doctrine touching servants obedience, I would advise you Sr specially to consider; for whereas it is out of question, that infidells exacted workes of their Christian servants (as in the beginning of the Church many beleevuing servants had, unbeleevuing masters) on the Lords day no lesse then others; if their yeelding to that exacting of their Masters had beene sinne; would he haue commanded them to obey their Masters in all things? And to please them in all things without excepting of any day or of any labour? For that heathen masters would exact of Christian servants their ordinary labour and service on the Lords day as well as on others you have no reason to doubt; except you thinke that heathen men would tender and respect more the religion of their Servants (that religion which themselves esteemed to be superstition & folly) then their owne profit. And then if Christian servants should haue withdrawen their obedience that day, rejecting and resisting their Masters commandements, whereas their vnbeleevuing servants willingly obeyed them, and laboured for their profit, had they not caused the name of God which they worshipped to be blasphemed and the doctrine which they professed to be evil spoken of? (which was the point of the Apostles doctrine I especially remembred you of) That God I say which commanded, and that doctrine which

which instructed servants to disobey their masters, & by depriving them of their service caused their hindrance? The Apostle knew full well this was not the way to propagate the Gospell, and enlarge the kingdom of Christ; he knew it was Christian meeknes & obedience, & humility, & patience that must doe it: and therefore he commandeth Christian servants to give their Masters all honour, to obey them in all things, & to please them in all things; that so their Masters seeing them more serviceable and profitable servants, and withall more vertuous then others were, might sooner bee drawn to like of the religion that made them such; whereas the contrary would haue beene manifestly a scandall, & grievous impeachment to the propagation of the gospell, and defamed it, for a doctrine of contumacy and disobedience, and for a seminary (as it were) of disturbance and sedition of families and commonwealths. And not only alienated the affections of Masters from their Christian servants: but inflamed all men with indignation and hatred against the Christian religion and the professors of it. Such therefore evidently is the importance and intendment of the Apostles doctrine (as vnpartiall men whom prejudice or selfe conceipt leads not away, may soone discern) very farre differing from this doctrine of yours. Touching which point of the Apostles instruction given to servants for this effectuall and generall obedience, you will not reply (I hope) as some haue done; that at first indeede it was permitted for the good of the Church; least the in-

crease of it, and proceeding of the Gospell should be hindred by offence given to the Gentiles. For would that haue beene permitted if it had beene vnlawfull? Or could the Church of God be increased by the sinnes of men? His Church increased by that whereby himselfe was dishonoured? Or would the Apostles haue permitted men to sinne (as now Iesuits doe) for the good of the Church? nay exhorted and commanded to it, who had himselfe expressly taught that wee must not doe euill that good may come of it? No neither of both can be; because either of both were a stain, and derogation to the righteousnesse of God: the intention therefore of the Apostles was simple, without all tricks of policy, to teach seruants all exact and entire obedience to their Masters, touching all workes that belong to the duty of seruants; namely that were in themselves honest and lawfull, without excepting of any day. Neither shall you finde (as I am verily perswaded, and I speake not at randome) if all the monuments of antiquity be searched through, either the practise of Christian seruants, or the doctrine of Christian preachers, to haue been any other; I say you shall not finde any remembrance in the ancient Church (if you search the bookes of histories) that it was the custome of Christian seruants, to withdraw their obediēce from their Masters on the Lords day; nor (if you search the bookes of doctrine) that ever any Father or teacher of the Church so perswaded or instructed thē: no, nor yet if you adde to them the Heathen writers also, that liued in the age of the
ancient

ancient Church, and whereof diverse were sharpe and bitter enemies to the Christian religion, and apt to take every advantage to caluminate and disgrace it, (such as *Lucian, Porphyrie, Iulian, Libanius, Eunapius* and others were) you shall never finde the detraction of servants obedience, objected to Christians; And certainly if in all antiquity, no history be found to record it; no father to perswade it; no enemy to object it; it may welsceme evident that this doctrine of servants withdrawing obedience from their Masters, for worke on the Lords day, was neither taught nor practised in the ancient Church.

And therefore Sr to draw to an end (for I grow weary, & haue already both dulled my penne and my selfe) I would advise you in the name of *Iesus Christ*, whose Minister you are & whose worke you haue in hand, to examine this doctrine of yours, what foundation it may haue in the word of God, & what effect in the Church of God; lest the foundation happily be your owne phantasie, not Gods word: the effect proue the poysoning not the nourishing of the Church. I know Sr you are not the first that set this doctrine abroad; nor the only man that drawes of the vessell; although few (as I am told) draw so freely as you. But I would advise you (sir) in the name of God, to beware betimes & draw not to deepe: It is all nought, it relieth already with them that haue good taste, like the water of *Marah*: It will prouelike that of *Meribah* a little lower; & if you happe to draw to the bottome you will finde the dreggs to bee nothing but distur-

bance and sedition both in Church and Commonwealth. But I sayd in the beginning, I would neither censure nor divine of the evill consequence of this Doctrine: let them censure (if they will) to whom the government of the Church and Commonwealth, and provision of peace in both doth belong. And to divine (me thinkes) there is little neede; the events are too evident euen to meane foresights already to require divination: for who (when he seeth that seede sown) doubts what graine will be reaped in harvest? I will therefore neither censure nor divine of the fruits of your doctrine, but omit both and make an end. If the reasons which I haue produced against your opinion satisfie not you, you may doe well to satisfie them. And to establish your doctrine with better. It is the part of Christs minister, to giue a reason of his doctrine when it is called in question, and accused of novelty and of sinfull consequence, as I accuse yours: and if you take me to be in an error and bee able to reforme it, it is your duty to doe it. If your brothers beast went a stray, you were to reduce it home by *Moses* law. *Christs* law will lesse suffer you, to see your brother goe astray and not restore him. Wherefore if you bee assured that your doctrine is truly Christian and bee able to justify it; you are bound to doe it.

The faith you owe to Christ, whose minister you are, the charity you owe to Christians, whose pastor or doctor you are, exact it of you, and I especially challenge it, that haue felt my selfe specially greeued,
and

and (as I thinke) wronged by occasion of it. I looke therefore you should both answere my arguments, if they perswade you not, and produce better to perswade me; but first in your answers, I must intreat you to deale with me (as I would with you) honestly and ingeniously, and without either perverting or shifting of any arguments; to answere directly to the force of them. And secondly in your reasons to let me haue as few words as you will, but direct and materiall arguments; For if they be light and haue but smal force, they will not moue me. If sophisticall and haue but seeming force, I shall espy the deceit (I thinke) and be able to discerne betwixt a visard and a visage; both the one sort and the other of such arguments will but prejudice your cause with me, & were better kept for some other disciple; but if you finde your selfe not able to establish and justify this doctrine, wherewith I take my poore kinsman to haue beene corrupted, then I challenge you as you will answere it at the judgement seat of almighty God when your accounting day shall come, to repaire the ruine you haue made in his conscience, and (remoouing his scandall which hindreth him in his vocation) to establish him in his former obedience to his Master. So fare you well, and the spirit of truth bee with you.

May 16. 1611.